UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/691,872	10/23/2003	Sterling Reasor	MSFT121743	6758

26389 7590 01/23/2007

CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC
1420 FIFTH AVENUE
SUITE 2800
SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347

EXAMINER	
JOO, JOSHUA	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2154	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/23/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/691,872	REASOR ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Joshua Joo	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11/20/2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-39* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-39* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

Response to Amendment filed 11/20/2006

1. Claims 1-39 are presented for examination.

Allowable Subject Matter

2. As set forth in the Office Action filed 5/15/2006, claims 11, 12, 23, 24, 36, and 37 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Terminal Disclaimer

3. The terminal disclaimer filed on 11/20/2006 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application, which would extend beyond the expiration date of the full statutory term, as presently shortened by a terminal disclaimer of any patent granted on prior application no. 11/179433 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-39 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

6. Claims 13, 25, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed

to non-statutory subject matter.

Applicant is seeking to patent a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions. A computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions may be interpreted as computer-executable instructions, i.e. software, per se. Therefore, the claimed invention of a computer-readable medium does not meet one of the four categories of invention and is not statutory. Specifically, a computer-readable medium is not a series of steps or acts and thus is not a process. A computer-readable medium is not a physical article or object and as such is not a machine or manufacture. A computer-readable medium is not a combination of substances and therefore not a composition of matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1, 5, 7, 13, 14, 27, 28, 32, 38, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mao et al, US Publication #2003/0041054 (Mao hereinafter), in view of Aron et al. US Publication #2005/0209951 (Aron hereinafter).

9. As per claim 1, Mao teaches substantially the invention as claimed including a method for managing data available for access on the network, Mao's teachings comprising:

obtaining, at a host computing device included as part of the computer network and associated with a user, a request to identify data corresponding to a set of criteria (Paragraph 0022; 0025. Sends query to a computer. Paragraph 0006. Queries consist of words or data desired.);

automatically obtaining an identification of data stored on at least one computing device included in the computer network and matching the set of criteria (Paragraph 0025. Queries other computers and receives result lists.);

merging the identification of data stored on at least one computing device included in the computer network (Paragraph 0025. Merge results lists.); and

generating a result of the merging the identification of data stored on the host computing device associated with the user request and the identification of data stored on at least one computing device included in the computer network (Paragraph 0025. Result is returned and displayed to user. Paragraph 0037. Results list.).

10. Mao teaches of merging identification of data stored on multiple computing devices. However, Mao does not specifically teach of obtaining an identification of data stored on the host computing device associated with the user request and matching the set of criteria; and merging the identification of data stored on the host computing device associated with the user request and the identification of data stored on at least one computing device included in the computer network.

Aron teaches of performing a search comprising a local search and a network search, wherein the results of the local search and network search are merged and display to a user (Paragraphs 0450; 0889).

11. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Mao and Aron to perform a local search in addition to the network search, and merge the results of the local and network searches for display to the user since both teachings deal with searching content in network nodes and merging results. The teachings of Aron would improve the system of Mao by providing a more efficient method of searching content on the network.

12. As per claim 27, Mao teaches substantially the invention as claimed including a computer network having a computing device directly associated with a user and at least one remote computing device in communication, a method for managing data available for access on the network, Mao's teachings comprising:

obtaining, by the computing device directly associated with a user, a request to identify data corresponding to a set of criteria (Paragraph 0022; 0025. Sends query to a computer. Paragraph 0006. Queries consist of words or data desired.);

transmitting, by the computing device directly associated with a user, a request to the remote computing device for an identification of content matching the set of criteria (Paragraph 0025. Queries other computers.);

obtaining, by the remote computing device, an identification of locally stored content matching the set of criteria (Paragraph 0025. Compiles own results lists.);

transmitting, by the remote computing device, the identification of locally stored content matching the set of criteria ((Paragraph 0025. Return results to computer);

merging, by the computing device directly associated with the user, content matching the set of criteria (Paragraph 0025. Merge results.); and

generating, by the computing device directly associated with the user, a result of the merged content matching the set of criteria (Paragraph 0025. Displays results to user.).

13. Mao teaches of merging identification of data stored on multiple computing devices. However, Mao does not specifically teach of obtaining, by the computing device directly associated with a user, an identification of locally stored content matching the set of criteria.

Aron teaches of performing a search comprising a local search and a network search, wherein the results of the local search and network search are merged and display to a user (Paragraphs 0450; 0889).

14. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Mao and Aron to perform a local search in addition to the network search, and merge the results of the local and network searches for display to the user since both teachings deal with searching content in network nodes and merging results. The teachings of Aron would improve the system of Mao by providing a more efficient method of searching for content on the network.

15. As per claim 5, Mao teaches the method as recited in claim 1, wherein obtaining an identification of data stored on at least one computing device included in the computer network and matching the set of criteria includes generating a database query corresponding to a request to identify data corresponding to the set of criteria (Paragraph 0025. Generates query corresponding to requested data. Search contents of databases.).

16. As per claim 7, Mao teaches the method as recited in claim 1, wherein the computer network includes three or more networked computers (Fig. 1; Paragraph 0025; 0030. Plurality of computers.) and wherein obtaining an identification of data stored on at least one computing device included in the computer network and matching the set of criteria includes obtaining an identification of data stored on each computer included in the computer network and matching the set of criteria (Paragraph 0025. Queries computers corresponding to requested data. Returns result matching query.).

17. As per claims 13 and 38, Mao teaches the computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the method recited in claims 1 and 27 (Paragraph 0022; 0023; 0025. Computer.).

18. As per claims 14 and 39, Mao teaches the computer system having a processor, a memory and an

operating system, the computer system operable to perform the method recited in claims 1 and 39 (Paragraph 0022; 0023; 0025. Computer.).

19. As per claim 32, Mao teaches the method as recited in claim 27, wherein the computer network includes a second networked computer remote from the user, the method further comprising:

transmitting, by the computing device directly associated with a user, a request to the second remote computing device for an identification of content matching the set of criteria (Paragraph 0025. Queries other computers.);

obtaining, by the second remote computing device, an identification of locally stored content matching the set of criteria (Paragraph 0025. Compiles results list.);

transmitting, by the second remote computing device, the identification of locally stored content matching the set of criteria (Paragraph 0025. Returns result list.); and

merging, by the computing device directly associated with the user, content matching the set of criteria (Paragraph 0025. Merge the lists.).

20. Claims 3, 4, 6, 9, 29, 30, 31, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mao and Aron, in view of Orita, US Patent #5,163,147 (Orita hereinafter).

21. As per claims 3 and 29, Mao does not specifically teach the methods as recited in claims 2 and 28, wherein the request to identify data corresponding to the set of criteria corresponds to data in which the user is determined to be an owner of the data.

Orita teaches a system of accessing files on a host computer, wherein a user provides identification information to access the files, and the host computer determines the user's access level (Col 3, lines 10-16; Col 4, lines 60-65).

22. Orita does not explicitly teach of determining the owner of the data, but Orita teaches a system of determining whether a user is granted access to read and modify the data. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that a user with access privileges to read and modify data may be the owner of the data. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Mao, Aron, and Orita to determine the user's access level, which would improve the system of Mao and Aron by providing access protection to data stored on a network.

23. As per claims 4 and 30, Mao does not specifically teach the method as recited in claims 2 and 28, wherein the request to identify data corresponding to the set of criteria corresponds to data in which the user is determined to have permission to view the data.

Orita teaches of requesting access to data, wherein the user is determined to have permission to view the data (Col. 4, lines 60-65).

24. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Mao, Aron, and Orita to determine user's permission to view the data because the system of Mao and Aron deals with accessing database on the network. Orita's teachings would improve the system by providing access protection to data stored on a network, thus preventing unauthorized access.

25. As per claims 6 and 31, Mao does not specifically teach the method as recited in claims 1 and 27, wherein obtaining an identification of data stored on at least one computing device included in the computer network and matching the set of criteria includes transmitting a security identifier corresponding to the user.

Orita teaches of transmitting a security identifier corresponding to the user to access files on a host computer (Col 3, lines 10-19).

26. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Mao, Aron, and Orita to transmit a security identifier corresponding to the user to access files on a host computer because the system of Mao and Aron also deals with accessing database on the network. The teachings of Orita would improve the system by allowing the system to determine if the user has permission to access files stored on the database, thereby increasing the security of the data stored on the network.

27. As per claims 9 and 34, Mao does not specifically teach the method as recited in claims 1 and 27 further comprising:

obtaining, by the computing device directly associated with the user, an indication to manipulate data corresponding to the result of the merged content, wherein the data selected to be manipulated is stored on the remote computing device;

transmitting, by the computing device directly associated with the user, the request to manipulate the selected data and a security identifier to the remote computing device;

obtaining, by the remote computing device, the request to manipulate the selected data and the security identifier to determine whether the user is authorized to manipulate the selected data;

transmitting, by the remote computing device, permission to manipulate the selected data;

obtaining, by the computing device directly associated with the user, the permission; and

manipulating, by the computing device directly associated with the user, the selected data.

28. Orita teaches of obtaining, by user's work station, a request to modify, i.e. manipulate, data stored on a remote computer (Col. 4, lines 49-55; Col. 5, lines 1-7), wherein a security identifier corresponding

to the user is transmitted to a host computer (Col. 3, lines 10-19), and permission is obtained to modify the data (Col. 4, lines 60-67).

29. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Mao, Aron, and Orita to obtain, by user's work station, a request to modify, i.e. manipulate, data stored on a remote computer, wherein a security identifier corresponding to the user is transmitted to a host computer, and permission is obtained to modify the data. The teachings of Orita would improve the system of Mao and Aron by providing a secure method to modify data stored on the network.

30. Claims 8 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mao and Aron, in view of Takano, US Publication #2002/0099685 (Takano hereinafter).

31. As per claims 8 and 33, Mao does not specifically teach the method as recited in claims 1 and 27, wherein generating a result includes displaying the identification of the data without identifying the location of the data.

Takano teaches of merging results from different databases and displaying the results without identifying the location of the data (Fig. 11, 28; Paragraph 0142; 0149).

32. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Mao, Aron, and Takano to display the results without identifying the location of the data because all three teachings deal with the similar system of merging results from different databases. The teachings of Takano would improve the system of Mao and Aron by allowing the user to access results based on mega-data associated with search terms.

33. Claims 10 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mao and Aron, in view of Yamanoue, US Patent #6,745,180 (Yamanoue hereinafter).

34. As per claims 10 and 35, Mao does not specifically teach the method as recited in claims 1 and 27 further comprising maintaining a record of the result of the merging the identification of data stored on the host computing device associated with the user request and the identification of data stored on at least one computing device included in the computer network.

Yamanoue teaches of storing the results of the query (Abstract; Col 3, lines 50-51).

35. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Mao, Aron, and Yamanoue to store the results of the search query since the system of Mao and Aron provides a result to a search query. The teachings of Yamanoue would improve the system by using the stored results to process subsequent results.

36. Claims 2, 15, 18, 20, 25, 26, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mao and Aron, in view of Simmon et al. US Patent #6,389,477 (Simmon hereinafter).

37. As per claims 2 and 28, Mao teaches the method as recited in claims 1 and 27, wherein the request to identify data corresponding to the set of criteria corresponds to a request to view data (Paragraph 0007; 0011; 0026. Query for WWW-based data.). However, Mao does not specifically teach of data associated with a unique identifier corresponding to the user.

Simmon teaches of reading desired information from a database corresponding to user ID transmitted with a message (Col. 20, lines 27-31).

38. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Mao, Aron, and Simmon to read desired information corresponding to a user

ID because all three teachings deal with systems for obtaining information. The teachings of Simmon would improve the system of Mao and Aron by providing additional search criteria for identifying content stored on a network.

39. As per claim 15, Mao teaches substantially the invention as claimed including a method for managing data available for access on the network, Mao's teachings comprising:

obtaining a user request to identify content stored on the two or more computing devices (Paragraph 0025. Sends queries to a computer. Paragraph 0006. Queries consist of words or data desired.);

automatically querying the two or more computing devices within the computer network to identify the contents of local computing storage locations (Paragraph 0025. Transmits query to other computers and return result lists.);

merging the results of the queries (Paragraph 0025. Merge results lists.); and

displaying the results of the merge query results (Paragraph 0025. Result is returned and displayed to user. Paragraph 0037. Results list.).

40. Mao teaches substantial features of the claimed invention including querying data to identify content associated with user criteria (Paragraph 0006; 0025). However, Mao does not teach of obtaining a user request to identify content stored on a local computing device; and querying to identify content associated with a unique user identifier.

Aron teaches of performing a search comprising a local search and a network search, wherein the results of the local search and network search are merged and display to a user (Paragraphs 0450; 0889).

41. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Mao and Aron to perform a local search in addition to the network search,

and merge the results of the local and network searches for display to the user since both teachings deal with searching content in network nodes and merging results. The teachings of Aron would improve the system of Mao by providing a more efficient method of searching for content on the network.

42. Mao and Aron still do not specifically teach of querying to identify content associated with a unique user identifier.

Simmon teaches of reading desired information from a database corresponding to user ID transmitted with a message (Col. 20, lines 27-31).

43. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Mao, Aron, and Simmon to read desired information corresponding to a user ID because all three teachings deal with systems for obtaining information. The teachings of Simmon would improve the system of Mao and Aron by providing additional search criteria for identifying content stored on a network.

44. As per claim 18, Mao, Aron, and Simmon taught the method as recited in claim 15. Mao further teaches wherein automatically querying the two or more computing devices within the computer network to identify the contents of local computing device storage locations corresponding to the unique user identifier includes generating a database query corresponding to identify content corresponding to the unique user identifier (Paragraph 0025; 30. Generates queries corresponding to requested data. Returns result matching query. Search contents of databases.).

45. As per claim 20, Mao, Aron, and Simmon taught the method as recited in claim 15. Mao further teaches wherein the computer network includes three or more network computers (Fig. 1; Paragraph 0025; 0030. Plurality of computers.) and wherein automatically querying the two or more computing

devices within the computer network to identify the contents of local computing device storage locations corresponding to the unique user identifier includes querying each computer included in the computer network to identify the contents of local computing device storage locations corresponding to the unique user identifier (Paragraph 0025. Query computers to identify content corresponding to criteria. Paragraph 0022. Search and merging may be performed on any computer.).

46. As per claim 25, Mao teaches the computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the method recited in claim 15 (Paragraph 0022; 0023; 0025. Computer.).

47. As per claim 26, Mao teaches the computer system having a processor, a memory and an operating system, the computer system operable to perform the method recited in claim 15 (Paragraph 0022; 0023; 0025. Computer.).

48. Claims 16, 17, 19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mao, Aron, and Simmons, in view of Orita.

49. As per claim 16, Mao does not specifically teach the method as recited in claim 15, wherein the request to identify content corresponding to the unique user identifier corresponds to content in which the user is determined to be an owner of the content.

Orita teaches a system of accessing files on a host computer, wherein the user provides identification information to access the files, and the system determines the user's access level (Col 3, lines 10-16; Col 4, lines 60-65).

50. Orita does not explicitly teach of determining the owner of the data, but Orita teaches a system of determining whether a user is granted access to read and modify the data. Therefore, it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that a user with privileges to read and modify data may be the owner of the data. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Mao, Aron, Simmon, and Orita to determine the user's access level, which would improve the system of Mao And Aron by providing access protection to data stored on a network.

51. As per claim 17, Mao does not specifically teach the method as recited in claim 15, wherein the request to identify data corresponding to the set of criteria corresponds to data in which the user is determined to have permission to view the data.

Orita teaches of requesting access to data, wherein the user is determined to have permission to view the data (Column 4, lines 60-65).

52. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Mao, Aron, and Orita to determine user's permission to view the data because the system of Mao, Aron, and Simmon deals with accessing database on the network. Orita's teachings would improve the system by providing access protection to data stored on a network, thus preventing unauthorized access.

53. As per claim 19, Mao does not specifically teach the method as recited in claim 15, wherein automatically querying the two or more computing devices within the computer network to identify the contents of local computing device storage locations corresponding to the unique user identifier includes processing a security identifier associated with the unique user identifier.

Orita teaches of transmitting a security identifier corresponding to the user to access files on a host computer (Col 3, lines 10-19).

54. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Mao, Aron, Simmon, and Orita to transmit a security identifier corresponding to the user to access files on a host computer because the system of Mao, Aron, and Simmon deals with accessing database on a network. The teachings of Orita would improve the system by allowing the system to determine if the user has permission to access files stored on the database, thereby increasing the security of the data stored on the network.

55 As per claim 21, Mao does not specifically teach the method as recited in claim 15 further comprising:

obtaining a request to manipulate on or more pieces of content included in the merged results, wherein the content selected to be manipulated is remote from a computing obtaining the request;

transmitting a security identifier corresponding to the unique user identifier;

obtaining permission to manipulate the selected content; and

manipulated the content selected to be manipulated.

56. Orita teaches of obtaining, by user's work station, a request to modify, i.e. manipulate, data stored on a remote computer (Col. 4, lines 49-55; Col. 5, lines 1-7), wherein a security identifier corresponding to the user is transmitted to a host computer (Col. 3, lines 10-19), and permission is obtained to modify the data (Col. 4, lines 60-67).

57. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Mao, Aron, Simmons, and Orita to obtain, by user's work station, a request to modify, i.e. manipulate, data stored on a remote computer, wherein a security identifier corresponding to the user is transmitted to a host computer, and permission is obtained to modify the data. The teachings

of Orita would improve the system of Mao, Aron, and Simmon by providing a secure method to modify data stored on the network.

58. Claims 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mao, Aron, and Simmon, in view of Yamanoue.

59. As per claim 22, Mao does not specifically teach the method as recited in claim 15 further comprising maintaining a record of the result of the merging the results of the queries.

Yamanoue teaches of storing the results of the query (Abstract; Col 3, lines 50-51).

60. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Mao, Aron, Simmon, and Yamanoue to store the results of the search query since the system of Mao, Aron, and Simmon provides results to a search query. The teachings of Yamanoue would improve the system by using the stored results to process subsequent results.

Conclusion

61. The following prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

i) Singhal US Patent #6,567,810 teaches of merging local search results and search results from other computers (See claim 1).

ii) Halevy et al. US Publication #2004/0153440 teaches of processing a query locally and use other remote nodes and merging results (See abstract; Paragraph 0054).

62. A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.

63. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua Joo whose telephone number is 571 272-3966. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday 8AM to 5PM and every other Friday.

64. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan J. Flynn can be reached on 571 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

65. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

January 9, 2007
JJ

NATHAN J. FLYNN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800